

REMARKS

Currently pending in this application are claims 1-31, 59-75, and 90-107. Claims 1-31, 59-75, and 90 and 102 have been amended. Claims 78-89 were previously withdrawn without prejudice. Claims 32-58 and 76-77 are canceled. Applicant requests entry of this Amendment and reconsideration of the pending claims in view of these Remarks.

The Examiner rejected claims 1-17, 21-58 and 62-76 under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over DaGraca (US 6,646,676) in view of Brodsky (US 6,731,805). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection. Applicant submits that claims 1-17, 21-58 and 62-76 are allowable over the combination of DeGraca '676 and Brodsky '805 for each of the following reasons.

Claim 1 has been amended and specifies:

comparing at the remote location the uncompressed digital pixel data of the original scene and the uncompressed digital pixel data of the subsequent scene to provide at least one motion difference value, the at least one motion difference value representing magnitude of change between the uncompressed digital pixel data of the original scene and the uncompressed digital pixel data of the subsequent scene.

DeGraca '676 clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest these limitations. Neither Brodsky '805 nor any other cited reference cures this deficiency. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable.

Claim 1 has been amended further and specifies:

the transmitted data being transmitted over the internet protocol network if the at least one difference value meets at least one threshold value ...

relating to modification of the original scene, the transmitted data including at least one difference value and at least one of the following: compressed digital still image data of the subsequent scene, and compressed digital motion video data of the subsequent scene.

DeGraca '676 clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest these limitations. Neither Brodsky '805 nor any other cited reference cures this deficiency. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion that teachings by DeGraca '676 regarding "dc-images" somehow meet the specified limitations set forth above.

Claim 1 has been amended and further specifies:

displaying at the receiving station transmitted data, the display of transmitted data including:

a graphical representation of the at least one difference value, and the at least one of the following:

compressed digital still image data of the subsequent scene, and compressed digital motion video data of the subsequent scene.

DeGraca '676 clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest these limitations. Neither Brodsky '805 nor any other cited reference cures this deficiency. Accordingly, claim 1 is allowable. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's assertion that teachings by DeGraca '676 regarding "dc-images" somehow meet the specified limitations set forth above.

Claims 2-31 and 59-75, which are dependent upon claim 1, are allowable because claim 1 is allowable, and further in view of the additional subject matter specified therein. More particularly, claims 2-31 and 59-75 have also been amended to

more specifically set forth the subject matter which the applicant regards as being allowable, and thus are also considered to be allowable in view of the additional allowable subject matter specified therein.

Brodsky '805 cannot be combined with DeGraca '676, because there is no motivation for one skilled in the art to combine the teachings of DeGraca '676 and Brodsky '805 as suggested by the Examiner, except by using the present application as a template through hindsight reconstruction of applicant's claims. One of ordinary skill in the art would not have reasonably looked to DeGraca '676. As described in detail in DeGraca '676 discloses or teaches automatic processing of audio-visual information acquired by a camera. Accordingly, there is no motivation for one of ordinary skill in the art to introduce a receiving station including a display for viewing the transmitted data. This would be contrary to the teachings of DeGraca '676. Further, even having DeGraca '676 in hand, one skilled in the art would not combine it with Brodsky '805 or otherwise modify DeGraca '676 to replace automatic processing with a human operator.

For the foregoing reasons, claims 1-31 and 59-75 are allowable. Claims 2-31 and 59-75, which are dependent upon claim 1, have also been amended to more specifically set forth the subject matter which the applicant regards as being allowable, and thus are also considered to be allowable in view of the additional allowable subject matter specified therein.

Claims 18-20 and 77 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over DaGraca (US 6,646,676) in view of Brodsky (US 6,731,805) as applied to claims 1-4, 14 and 16 in view of Kohno US 2003/0048356A1. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection. Claim 77 has been canceled. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 18-20 are dependent upon independent claim 1 and are allowable over the combination of DeGraca '676, Brodsky '805 and Kohno for the reasons set forth above. Clearly, Kohno does not cure the deficiencies of DeGraca '805 and Brodsky '805 explained above with

reference to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 18-20 are allowable. Claims 18-20 are also allowable in view of the additional subject matter specified therein. Claims 18-20 have also been amended to more specifically set forth the subject matter which the applicant regards as being allowable, and thus are also considered to be allowable in view of the additional allowable subject matter specified therein.

Because DeGraca '676 teaches an automatic system and thus teaches away from using human operators to review displayed data, one of skill in the art would not be motivated either to (i) consult DeGraca '676 in order to address a problem which presumably was solved by DeGraca '676 teaching an automatic system; or (ii) combine any other reference with DeGraca '676 in relation to a system involving human operators. Certainly there is no suggestion or motivation in DeGraca '676, Brodsky '805 or Kohno to consult or combine the teachings of the other references, and the Examiner has not set forth more than a very general rationale to suggest that one skilled in the art would consider combining them. Certainly, the Examiner has not provided the necessary specific argument or specific reasoning why one of skill in the art would combine the teachings of these three references. And, even if the references could be combined as generally suggested by the Examiner, it is unclear to Applicant whether such a combination would be functional.

Claims 59-61 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103 as being unpatentable over DaGraca (US 6,646,676) in view of Brodsky (US 6,731,805) as applied to claims 3 and 21 in view of Leung US 6,643,779. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection. Applicant respectfully submits that claims 59-61 are dependent upon independent claim 1 and are allowable over the combination of DeGraca '676, Brodsky '805 and Leung for the reasons set forth above regarding claim 1. Clearly, Leung does not cure the deficiencies of DeGraca '805 and Brodsky '805 explained above with reference to claim 1. Accordingly, claims 59-61 are allowable. Claims 59-61 have also been amended to more specifically set forth the subject matter which the applicant regards as being allowable, and

thus claims 59-61 are also considered to be allowable in view of the additional allowable subject matter specified therein.

Claims 90, 94-98 and 100-101 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda '466 in view of Shibata '491. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection.

Honda '466 clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest a camera having the construction specified in claim 90. The Examiner asserts that Honda '466 at FIG. 6 teaches a camera having the construction specified in Claims 90, 94-98, and 100-101. Applicant respectfully disagrees and traverses this grounds for rejection. Honda '466 at FIG. 6 clearly shows a "camera 601" connected to a separate "storage device 602", and an "image compression apparatus 100" in turn connected to "storage device 602". Applicant notes, in particular, that structure identified as "storage device 602" intervenes between "image compression apparatus 100" and "camera 601". Applicant respectfully submits that the Examiner is not free to ignore this intervening structure. Nor does Honda '466 teach including the structure and function of storage device 602 and image compression apparatus 100 into a camera 601. Shibata '491 clearly does not teach a camera having the specified construction and thus does not cure the deficiencies of claim 90. Accordingly, claim 90 and dependent claims 91-101 are allowable over Honda '466.

Similarly, Honda '466 fails to disclose, teach or suggest the following limitations specified in claim 90:

A camera adapted to be connected to a packet switching network.

For example Honda '466 at FIG. 6 teaches a camera 601 connected to storage device 602. Of course, storage device 602 is not a packet switching network. In Honda '466 at FIG. 7, a video camera 701 is connected to an "image compression

apparatus 100”. Again, of course, “image compression apparatus 100” is not a packet switching network. Shibata ‘491 does not cure this deficiency of Honda ‘466 with respect to claim 90.

Claim 90 has been amended and specifies:

the camera being adapted to send over the packet switching network in a second sequence of data packets the compressed second set of digitized pixel data and at least one of the following:

the selected set of pixel difference values and the indicator, the second sequence of data packets being sent over the packet switching network only when the indicator provides indication of the event.

Honda ‘466 does not disclose, teach or suggest the limitations set forth above. Honda ‘466 clearly does not disclose, teach or suggest a camera having the specified construction. Neither Shibata ‘491 nor any other reference cures this deficiency. Accordingly, claim 90 and dependent claims 91-101 are allowable.

Claims 91-93, 99, and 102-107 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Honda ‘466 in view of Shibata ‘491 as applied to claim 90, and further in view of Brodsky ‘805. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection. These claims are allowable for the same reasons set forth in the preceding for claim 90. The reasons will not be repeated, but are incorporated in this paragraph by reference.

The Remarks set forth above are believed to place the application in condition for allowance. Accordingly, in view of the foregoing Remarks, Applicant requests allowance of claims 1-31, 59-75 and 90-107. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to contact the undersigned to resolve any remaining matters by Examiner's Amendment, if possible. The Commissioner is hereby authorized to withdraw, or credit, any unpaid fee(s) associated with this Response from Deposit Account No. 50-4128.

Respectfully submitted,

/Jeffrey D. Hunt/

Jeffrey D. Hunt, Reg. 38,189

Date: April 11, 2008

Customer Number 67589
MOORE LANDREY, L.L.P.
1609 Shoal Creek Blvd., Ste. 100
Austin, Texas 78701
Telephone: 512.499-8900
Facsimile: 512.320-8906